RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 19 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicant will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action. Before doing so, however, the undersigned would like to thank Examiner Ly for courtesies extended during a telephone interview on March 9, 2007. During the telephone interview, the Rubinstein patent and the way in which the Examiner is applying it to the claims was discussed. The Examiner explained that it is his position that the keywords and keyword phrases discussed in the Rubinstein patent teach the claimed "keyword information." The undersigned noted that this information is generated from an initial set of search results based on a linguistic analysis in the Rubinstein patent, and is not "extracted from the query" as claimed. The Examiner noted that he was interpreting "extracted from the query" broadly to include information indirectly derived from the query. Although, the applicants respectfully disagree with such an

interpretation, independent claims 46, 49 and 51 have been amended to expedite prosecution of this application.

The undersigned also noted that the Rubinstein patent requires a user entry of a search query to provide a first set of search results, and a further manual user selection of keyword phrases to generate a final search result (or search results). The Examiner noted that this was not precluded by the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 46, 49, 51, and 53-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,913,215 ("the Rubinstein patent"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

First, since claims 53, 56 and 59 have been canceled, this ground of rejection is rendered moot with respect to these claims.

Independent claim 46, as amended, is not anticipated by the Rubinstein patent because the Rubinstein patent does not include an act of generating a set of final search results from the accepted search results using segments of the search results, wherein each of which segments includes at least one keyword included in a query from which the search results were generated. Rather, the Rubinstein patent uses keyword phrases, which where (1) determined from an initial set of search results (using linguistic analysis) and (2) manually selected by a user to construct a further query expression. (See, e.g., Figure 1, blocks 110 and 120 of

the Rubinstein patent.) Independent claims 49 and 51 have been similarly amended and are similarly not anticipated by the Rubinstein patent.

Since claims 54 and 55 depend from claim 46, since claims 57 and 58 depend from claim 49, and since claims 60 and 61 depend from claim 51, these claims are similarly not anticipated by the Rubinstein patent.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 47, 48, 50 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rubinstein patent as applied to claims 46, 49 and 51 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,051 ("the Thomson patent"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

The Examiner cites the Thomson patent as teaching determining, using accepted keyword information, whether or not a candidate search result is similar to a search result already in a set of final search results, and adding the search results to the set of final search results only if it is determined that the candidate search result is not similar to any search results already in the set of final search results, citing column 4, line 55 through column 5, line 12, and column 10, lines 1-16 and 31-48. (See Paper No. 20061011, page 5.) The applicants respectfully note that although the cited portions of the Thomson patent generally concern removing duplicate documents, such duplicates are identified by comparing an author, a title, or a publication date, and not by using a keyword from a query. Thus, these claims

are not rendered obvious by the Rubinstein and Thomson patents for at least this reason.

Further, even assuming, arguendo, that the Thomson patent includes the teaching alleged by the Examiner, and further assuming, arguendo, that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine these patents as proposed by the Examiner, such a combination would still not compensate for the deficiencies of the Rubinstein patent with respect to claims 46, 49 and 51, discussed above. Thus, these claims are not rendered obvious by the Rubinstein and Thomson patents for at least this additional reason.

New claims

New claims 62 and 63 depend from claims 46 and 51, respectively, and recite that certain acts are performed automatically, without the need for user intervention. These claims are supported, for example, by Figures 9, 10 and 14 and the associated description. This further distinguishes the claimed invention over the cited art.

New claims 64-67 and 68-71 depend from claim 46 and 51, respectively, and further define the claimed segments. These claims are supported, for example, by Figure 11, block 1115, Figure 12, block 1205 and § 4.3.1.1.1 of the specification.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the

applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

March 19, 2007

John C. Pokotylo, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,242
Tel.: (732) 542-9070

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (and any accompanying paper(s)) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent Office on the date shown below.

John C. Pokotylo
Type or print name of person signing certification

Signature

March 19, 2007
Date